UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,600	10/29/2003	Jeffrey F. Hatalsky	5957-63700	6849
	7590 08/05/200 , HOOD, KIVLIN, KC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 398		SHIBRU, HELEN		
AUSTIN, TX 7	8/6/-0398		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2621		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/696,600	HATALSKY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
HELEN SHIBRU	2621		

		TIELEN GINBING		2021	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appea	rs on the cover sheet w	with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE TH	HIS APPLI	CATION IN CONDITION	N FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior application, applicant must timely file one of the for application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance veriods:	ollowing re e of Appea	eplies: (1) an amendmen Il (with appeal fee) in col	ıt, affidavi mpliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the	_				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for repl Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either be	y expire late ox (a) or (b)	er than SIX MONTHS from	the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEF Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the per under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration dat set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the O may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR NOTICE OF APPEAL	The date or riod of exter the of the short the of the short the sh	nsion and the correspondin ortened statutory period for	ig amount reply origi	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief	in complia	ance with 37 CFR 41 37	must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must b AMENDMENTS	any extens	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.	.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final regard (a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NC) 	ırther cons	ideration and/or search			:cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without cand	on in bette	r form for appeal by mat	-		he issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 4	_	rresponding number of	illially reje	soled claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 (. See attached Notice o	f Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje					,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allo	wable if submitted in a s	•	-	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendmer how the new or amended claims would be rejected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13 and 15-22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ed is provid			i be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final arbecause applicant failed to provide a showing of was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	good and s				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date entered because the affidavit or other evidence fa showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is no 	ailed to ove	ercome <u>all</u> rejections und	der appea	al and/or appellant fail	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An ex REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	planation	of the status of the clain	ns after ei	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration See Continuation Sheet.				condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Staten</i>13. ☐ Other:	<i>nent</i> (s). (P	TO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Thai Tran/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's argument regarding the drawings the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant states the specification identifies each of the objected features. The Examiner agrees that the components are identified in the specification, however the drawings are not identifying the components. Figure 1 is not shown that component 14 is 'disk controller'. Figure 1 only shows a box which has the number 14 in it. The citted form paragraph is appropriate since it clearly states that a proper understanding of the discloses invention should be shown in the drawing. Applicant states "...Kazumasa does not teach extent determination, let alone 'dynamix' extent determination." In response the Examiner respectfully disagress, the term 'determined extent' or 'extent determination' is broad and the claim does not specifically recite 'to what extent'. Selecting the entire data or partial selection can both be an extent. In other words the degree to which it extend is not recited nor how the extent is determined nor what is based on is not recited.

Applicant states both the prior arts do not teach the limitation of claim 5. In response the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bannai discloses when providing a reduced image for displaying a summary, the decoding operation is terminated, and the image data are written in a predetrmined position of the memory. Kazumasa on the other hand teaches a microcomputer performs motion discrimination by accessing the frame memory during balnking period. Kazumasa further teaches the microcomputer generates a scanning bar display signal for visibly displaying a line, where interpolating processing is performed, and writes that signal into the frame memory. Here note that an editing process can be any functions that cause change in the data format, for example compression process is an editing process. Therefore the limitation of the claims read on the cited prior arts and the rejection is maintained.

.